

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT  
(San Joaquin)**

----

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

STEVE KENT BADUE,

Defendant and Appellant.

C087773

(Super. Ct. No.  
STK-CR-FER-2018-0007472)

Appointed counsel for defendant Steve Kent Badue filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts of the case and asks this court to review the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*).) After reviewing the entire record, we affirm the judgment.

We provide the following brief description of the facts and procedural history of the case. (See *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 110, 124.)

On June 18, 2018, Stockton police officers made contact with defendant, checked his name, and determined that he had failed to register as a sex offender pursuant to Penal Code section 290.<sup>1</sup> Defendant was required to register as a result of a felony conviction in 1998 for indecent exposure in violation of section 314.1.

Defendant pleaded no contest to a violation of section 290.012, subdivision (a). The trial court suspended imposition of sentence and placed defendant on five years of informal probation, subject to various conditions, including payment of assorted fines and fees and serving 364 days in county jail with nine days of actual presentence credit and conduct credits calculated by the sheriff.

Defendant appeals. He did not obtain a certificate of probable cause.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. Counsel filed an opening brief that sets forth the facts and procedural history of the case and requests this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of his right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days from the date the opening brief was filed. More than 30 days have elapsed, and defendant has not filed a supplemental brief. Having undertaken an examination of the entire record pursuant to *Wende*, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment.

---

<sup>1</sup> Undesignated statutory references are to the Penal Code.

## **DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

\_\_\_\_ BUTZ \_\_\_\_\_, J.

We concur:

\_\_\_\_ HULL \_\_\_\_\_, Acting P. J.

\_\_\_\_ KRAUSE \_\_\_\_\_, J.